

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.           | FILING DATE                    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/690,697                | 10/23/2003                     | Noriyasu Kuzuhara    | 02860.0685-01       | 9748             |  |
| 22852                     | 7590 12/28/2005                |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
|                           | N, HENDERSON, FAR              | SEFER, AHMED N       |                     |                  |  |
|                           | LLP<br>901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW |                      |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 |                                |                      | 2826                |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |   | Applicat   | ion No.  | Applicant(s)  |           | $\overline{}$ |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----------|---------------|
| Office Action Summary   |   | 10/690,6   | 97   | KUZUHARA ET AL  | _         | (MV)          |
|   |   | Examine  | r  | Art Unit  |           |               |
|   |   | A. Sefer   |  | 2826  |           |               |
| Period fo   | The MAILING DATE of this communicat<br>or Reply   | ion appears on th  | e cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add   | dress     |               |
| A SH<br>WHIC<br>- Exter<br>after<br>- If NO<br>- Failu<br>Any ( | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL assions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ING DATE OF T<br>7 CFR 1.136(a). In no e<br>ation.<br>ry period will apply and v<br>by statute, cause the ap | HIS COMMUNICATION vent, however, may a reply be tin will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE | N.<br>nely filed<br>the mailing date of this co<br>D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |           |               |
| Status  |   |  |  |   |           |               |
| 2a)   | Responsive to communication(s) filed of This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b). Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice of   | ★ This action is allowance excep   | t for formal matters, pro  |   | merits is |               |
| Dispositi   | ion of Claims   |  | ,  |   |           |               |
| 5)⊠<br>6)⊠<br>7)⊠<br>8)□<br><b>Applicat</b> i                   | Claim(s) 30-56 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are versions are subjected to by the Entre description is objected to by the Entre description is objected to perform a subject to restriction is objected to by the Entre drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)   | vithdrawn from control re rejected.  56 is/are objected and/or election xaminer.                             | d to.<br>requirement.  | Examiner.   |           |               |
| ا اردا  | Applicant may not request that any objection  | · ·  |  |   |           |               |
| 11)   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by  | correction is requi  | red if the drawing(s) is ob  | jected to. See 37 CF  |           |               |
| Priority (  | under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |   |           |               |
| 12) <u></u><br>a)∣  | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc  2. Certified copies of the priority doc  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for  | cuments have be<br>cuments have be<br>he priority docum<br>Bureau (PCT Ru                                    | en received.<br>en received in Applicati<br>ents have been receive<br>lle 17.2(a)).                              | on No ed in this National S   | Stage     |               |
| 2)  Notic 3) Infor  | et(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-<br>mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC<br>or No(s)/Mail Date  |  | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:                                       | ate   | )-152)    |               |

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed October 3, 2005 has been entered; no new claims have been introduced.

#### **Priority**

2. Submission of the translation of the foreign language application (JP 2000-220538) is acknowledged. Therefore, US PG-Pubs 2004/0245499 (Negoro et al.) is not available as a prior art.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 30, 37-39, 43 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murayama et al. ("Murayama") US PG-Pub 2004/0233363.

Murayama discloses in fig. 15 an optical compensation film or a polarizing plate comprising a polarizing element 2 (as in claim 48); a support 3a and an optically anisotropic layer 4a, wherein the optically anisotropic layer is a layer on which orientation of a liquid crystalline compound is fixed (par. 0256), wherein the support is an optically biaxial cellulose ester film, and wherein the liquid crystalline compound is rod-shaped (par. 0178).

Application/Control Number: 10/690,697

Art Unit: 2826

Regarding claims 37 and 38, Murayama discloses (pars. 0247, 0248 and 0580) an orientation layer prepared by rubbing the surface of the support (as in claim 38) on which the liquid crystalline compound of optically anisotropic layer is oriented.

Regarding claim 39, Murayama discloses (par. 0247) an optical orientation layer.

Regarding claim 43, Murayama discloses (par. 0273) rod-shaped liquid crystalline compound exhibiting optically positive uniaxial properties.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. ("Murayama") US PG-Pub 2004/0233363 in view of Okazaki et al. ("Okazaki") USPN 5,747,121.

Murayama discloses the device structure as recited in the claim, but lacks anticipation of dissolving-out blocking layer.

Okazaki discloses (see abstract) an optical compensation film comprising a dissolvingout blocking layer (polyvinyl alcohol).

Therefore, in view of Okazaki's teachings, one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify Murayama's device by incorporating a dissolving-out blocking layer since that would increase bonding strength as taught by Okazaki.

Regarding claims 44 and 46, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed arrangement or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentab ity is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

7. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Miyachi et al. ("Miyachi") USPN 6,493,053.

Murayama discloses in fig. 15 a liquid crystal display comprising a first polarizing plate 2b, a liquid crystal cell 5a, and a second polarizing plate 2a provided at a side closer to a viewer side than the side of the first polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell; an optical compensation film; a support 3a and an optically anisotropic layer 4a, wherein the optically anisotropic layer is a layer on which orientation of a liquid crystalline compound is fixed (par. 0256), wherein the support is an optically biaxial cellulose ester film, and wherein the liquid crystalline compound is rod-shaped (par. 0178); wherein the optical compensation film is provided between the first polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell or between the second polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell, but lacks anticipation of maximum index of refraction of the support.

Miyachi discloses (see col. 29, lines 53-59) a rubbing direction of a liquid crystal cell closer to an optical compensation film crosses orthogonally or almost orthogonally to a direction giving maximum index of the refraction of the support.

It would have been obvious incorporate Miyachi's teachings since that would provide an LCD with a high contrast as taught by Miyachi.

Application/Control Number: 10/690,697 Page 5

Art Unit: 2826

8. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama in view of Aminaka et al. USPN 6,081,312 ("Aminaka").

Murayama discloses in fig. 15 a liquid crystal display comprising a first polarizing plate 2b, a liquid crystal cell 5a, and a second polarizing plate 2a provided at a side closer to a viewer side than the side of the first polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell; an optical compensation film; a support 3a and an optically anisotropic layer 4a, wherein the optically anisotropic layer is a layer on which orientation of a liquid crystalline compound is fixed (par. 0256), wherein the support is an optically biaxial cellulose ester film, and wherein the liquid crystalline compound is rod-shaped (par. 0178); wherein the optical compensation film is provided between the first polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell or between the second polarizing plate and the liquid crystal cell, but lacks anticipation of a rubbing direction of the cell being parallel or almost parallel to a rubbing direction of an optical compensation film.

Aminaka discloses (see col. 8, lines 62-67) a rubbing direction of a liquid crystal cell closer to an optical compensation film being parallel to or almost parallel to a rubbing direction of an optical compensation film.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate Aminaka's teachings since that would increase the viewing angle as taught by Aminaka.

## Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 31-36, 40-42, 47, 49-51 and 54-56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2826

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1921.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS December 18, 2005